UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,083	07/10/2000	John R. Ehrman ﾠ·	STL9-2000-0055	9437

			EXAMINER
47069	7590	01/10/2006	PAULA, CESAR B

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
ATTN: IBM54
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/613,083	EHRMAN, JOHN R.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*20 October 2005*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/04*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20060105

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the RCE amendment filed on 10/20/2005.

This action is made Non-Final.

2.   In the amendment, claims 1-24 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are

independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement filed 9/23/2004 has been considered.

Drawings

4.   The drawings filed on 7/10/2000 have been accepted by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6.   Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with

the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant

art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed

invention. Claim 17 recites "storing a string of non-Unicode character in the constant" lines 8,

and 5. Claims 1, and 9 recite "storing a string of non-Unicode character in the constant" lines 8,

and 5. However, the specification pages 16, and 20-21 fail to describe the storage of the

characters in the constant as claimed.

7.   Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with

the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in

the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with

which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 17 recites "storing a

string of non-Unicode character in the constant" lines 8, and 5. Claims 1, and 9 recite "storing a

string of non-Unicode character in the constant" lines 8, and 5. However, the specification pages

16, and 20-21 fail to describe the storage of the characters in the constant as claimed, as to enable

one of ordinary skill in the art to perform the storage.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if
> the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would
> have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the

applicant's disclosure (pages 3-7, filed on 7/10/2000), in view of Lemay et al, herinafter Lemay,

"Laura Lemay's Web Workshop ActiveX, and VBScript", Sams, 1996, pp. 69-88, and further in

view of Edberg et al, hereinafter Edberg (Pat. # 5,793,381, 8/11/1998, as disclosed by the

applicant on 2/2/2001).

Regarding independent claim 1, applicant discloses the translation of a text—*data type--*

string—"abcDEF" from an non-Unicode format—"SBCS"-- to Unicode (page 5, lines 10-28). A

Hexadecimal encoding of the non-Unicode text string—*constant--* is created, and *stored in*

memory locations (boxes enclosing the character encoding) found in computer memory (lines

19-21). The text string stored comprises a non-Unicode text data type, which is to be converted

to Unicode-- *storing a string of non-Unicode characters in the constant which is stored in the*

memory of the computer.

Moreover, applicant discloses the translation of the text string—"abcDEF" as stored in

hexadecimal code in memory to Unicode format hexadecimal code, and replacing the same

characters with Unicode code stored in memory—*storing the Unicode character string in the*

constant, creating a string of Unicode characters stored in memory; (page 5, lines 10-28).

Moreover, the applicant fails to explicitly disclose: *creating a constant whose data type is*

a non-Unicode data type. However, Lemay teaches creating, and declaring a constant data type

to which data values are assigned (page 75, parag. 4-7, page 78). It would have been obvious to

a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of

applicant, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing a value that is fixed throughout a

program (page 75, parag.3-7). This would provide the benefit of efficiently translating fixed

amount of text to Unicode.

Furthermore, the applicant fails to explicitly disclose: *retrieving a specification in which the non-Unicode character string is encoded, and translating the non-Unicode character string...responsive to the specification of the code page.* However, Edberg teaches a code converter stored in a computer readable medium for converting non-Unicode strings to Unicode using a mapping table—*code page*-- containing the Unicode or "second character encoding" for converting the non-Unicode string to Unicode (col.3, lines 57-61, and col.4, lines 10-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of applicant, and Edberg, because this would provide the benefit of quickly providing a central location in memory, where the conversion code would be found, thus avoiding the time consuming task of looking for codes scattered throughout the computer memory.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—"abcDEF" from a non-Unicode format—"SBCS"-- to Unicode (page 5, lines 10-28).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—"<wxyz>" from a non-Unicode format—"pure DBCS"-- to Unicode (page 7, lines 1-17).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—"AB<wxyz>CD" from a non-Unicode format—"mixed SBCS/DBCS"-- to Unicode (page 6, lines 1-24).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—"abcDEF"-- from a non-Unicode format—"SBCS"-- to Unicode (page 5, lines 10-28). The applicant fails to explicitly disclose: *the translation is performed by the computer according to a scope, wherein the specification of the code page applies to translate constants in a portion of a computer program identified by the scope.* However, Edberg teaches a code converter stored in a computer readable medium for converting non-Unicode strings to Unicode using a mapping table—*code page*-- containing the Unicode or "second character encoding" for converting the non-Unicode string to Unicode (col.3, lines 57-61, and col.4, lines 10-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of applicant, and Edberg to translate the text strings using the code page, because the applicant teaches above the use of Unicode format. This would provide the advantage of providing a standardized data encoding for computer programs created, and exchanged from countries using different encoding schemes. This combination would also provide the benefit of quickly providing a central location in memory, where the conversion code would be found, thus avoiding the time consuming task of looking for codes scattered throughout the computer memory.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—"abcDEF"-- from a non-Unicode format—"SBCS"-- to Unicode (page 5, lines 10-28). the applicant fails to explicitly disclose: *the scope is global, the global scope specifying that the specification of the code page applies to translate constants in the entire computer program.*

However, Lemay teaches creating, and declaring a constant data type which can only be used within certain scope, such as in the whole program (pages 75, parag.8-77). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of applicant, Lemay and Edberg, because Lemay teaches quickly, and easily creating powerful scripts (page 70). This would provide the benefit of quickly, effortlessly translating fixed amount of text to Unicode.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 5, applicant discloses the translation of a text string—"<wxyz>" (subsequent to the SBCS, and mixed string) from a non-Unicode format— "pure DBCS"-- to Unicode (page 7, lines 1-17). The applicant fails to explicitly disclose: *the local scope specifying that the specification of the code page applies to translate constants in the subsequent portion of the computer program.* However, Lemay teaches creating, and declaring a constant data type which can only be used within certain scope, such as within a procedure (pages 75, parag.8-77). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of applicant, Lemay and Edberg, because Lemay teaches quickly, and easily creating powerful scripts (page 70). This would provide the benefit of quickly, effortlessly translating fixed amount of text to Unicode.

Claim 15 is directed towards a method for implementing the article of manufacture found in claim 7, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 23 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the article of manufacture found in claim 7, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 5, applicant discloses the translation of a text

string—"abcDEF" (*specific constant* portion or scope) from a non-Unicode format—"SBCS"--

to Unicode (page 5, lines 10-28).

Claims 9-16 are directed towards a method for implementing the article of manufacture

found in claims 1-8 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 17-24 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the article of

manufacture found in claims 1-8 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Regarding claims 1, 9, and 17, Applicant indicates that

page 5 of the cited application has no mention of the creation of a constant having Unicode, and

then storing non-Unicode string of characters in the constant (pages 8-9). The Applicant is

directed towards the rejection of the newly amended claims in light of the newly found prior art

above.

Claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 are rejected at least based on their dependency on claims 1.

9, and 17.

Conclusion

I.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. McConnell et al. (Pat. # 5,526,477).

II.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

(EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please

allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, go to http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have any questions about

access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866

217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Or faxed to:
- **(571)-273-8300 (for all** Formal communications intended for entry)

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER   1/6/06